



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,669	09/30/2003	Mario Elmen Tremblay	8598MR	5011

27752 7590 04/01/2009
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
Global Legal Department - IP
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor
299 East Sixth Street
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

ZHENG, LOIS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1793

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,669	Applicant(s) TREMBLAY ET AL.	
	Examiner LOIS ZHENG	Art Unit 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 March 2009 has been entered.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 16-17 are amended in view of applicant's amendments filed 23 March 2009. Claims 1-15 are canceled. Therefore, claims 16-17 are currently under examination.

Specification

3. Applicant's amendment to specification filed 23 March 2009 is entered and recorded.

Status of Previous Rejections/Objections

4. The objection to the specification is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to specification filed 23 March 2009.

5. The rejection of claims 1, 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn in view of the cancellation of claims 1, 9 and 15 filed 23 March 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buckley et al. US 6,632,347 B1(Buckley).

Buckley teaches an electrochemical apparatus comprising a concentrated salt solution tank(i.e. reservoir) that supplies concentrated salt solution to process water stream to locally form the electrolyte feed solution to the electrolyzer(Fig. 2 #20, col. 19 line 64 - col. 20 line 49). Buckley further teaches using a peristaltic pump for pumping the concentrated salt solution to the process water stream forming feed stream to the electrolyzer(col. 20 lines 41-45, Fig. 2). Buckley's electrolyzer comprise an anode, a cathode, a porous ceramic semi-permeable separator separating the anode and the cathode, an inlet for receiving the feed solution and an outlet for discharging effluent(col. 14 lines 34-41). The electrolyzer of Buckley further comprises a passage of feed solution adjacent to the anode and an electric current supply providing current to the electrolysis cell.

Regarding claim 16, the apparatus of Buckley is structurally the same as the halogen dioxide generating system as claimed. The electrolysis cell of Buckley also

Art Unit: 1793

reads on the claimed non-membrane electrolysis cell. In addition, the claimed halogen dioxide feed solution and the halogen dioxide salt are directed to material being worked on by the claimed apparatus, therefore, do not render the instant apparatus claims patentable. See MPEP 2115.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley and further in view of Kaczur et al. US 5,106,465 (Kaczur).

The teachings of Buckley are discussed in paragraph 8 above. Buckley further teaches that its anode is a titanium anode(col. 14 lines 25-27).

However, Buckley does not explicitly teach that the metal anode is porous.

Kaczur also teaches an electrolytic cell for the generation of chlorine dioxide (abstract). Kaczur further teaches the use of a porous platinum coated titanium anode(col. 4 lines 41-63).

Regarding claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the porous platinum coated titanium anode of Kaczur into the electrolytic apparatus of Buckley in order to utilize the high surface contact area due to the porosity of the anode and achieve high corrosion resistance as taught by Kaczur (col. 4 lines 44-45 and 57-60).

The porous anode of Buckley in view of Kaczur comprises a plurality of porous flow passages through which at least a portion of the aqueous feed solution flows. In addition, since the direction of electricity in the electrolysis cell of Buckley travels horizontally between the anode and the cathode chamber(Fig. 2 #62,64), the inlet to the electrolysis cell locates at the bottom of the electrolysis cell and the outlet locates at the top of the electrolysis cell, the examiner concludes that the electrolyte electrolysis cell of Buckley in view of Kaczur flows in a cross direction to the flow of electricity between the anode and cathode chambers as claimed. Buckley further teaches claimed return passage for recycling of feed as claimed (Fig. 2 # 126).

The remaining claim limitations are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 16 above.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley US 6,306,281 B1(Kelley) and Buckley et al. US 6,632,347 B1(Buckley).

Kelley teaches an electrolytic apparatus for the generation of chlorine dioxide(abstract). The apparatus comprises an aqueous sodium chlorite feed solution(col. 2 lines 55-61), a non-membrane electrolysis cell comprising an anode, a cathode, an inlet, an outlet(Fig. 1) and a power source connected to the anode and the cathode(col. 3 lines 18-21), thereby providing current through the aqueous feed solution.

Regarding claim 1, the inlet and the gap between the anode and the cathode of Kelley reads on the claimed passage for the feed solution adjacent to the anode. The inlet in the electrolytic apparatus of Kelley is capable of receiving aqueous feed solution

Art Unit: 1793

stream and the outlet in the apparatus of Kelly is capable of discharging halogen dioxide containing effluent as claimed.

In addition, the claimed halogen dioxide feed solution is directed to a material that is worked on by the instantly claimed apparatus. As stated in MPEP 2115, it is well settled that "[i]nclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims." *In re Young*, 75 F.2d 996, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)).

However, Kelley does not explicitly teach that the claimed means for delivering halogen dioxide salt directed to an aqueous feed solution inlet stream to locally form the aqueous halogen dioxide feed solution.

Buckley teaches an electrochemical apparatus comprising a concentrated salt solution tank(i.e. reservoir) that supplies concentrated salt solution to process water stream to locally form the electrolyte feed solution to the electrolyzer(Fig. 2 #20, col. 19 line 64 - col. 20 line 49). Buckley further teaches using a peristaltic pump for pumping the concentrated salt solution to the process water stream(col. 20 lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 16, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the electrolyte feeding mechanism of Buckley into the inlet stream of Kelley in order to monitor and control the flow of the feed solution and to maintain the concentration of the feed solution as taught by Buckley.

Therefore, the apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley comprises the claimed means for delivering halogen dioxide salt directly into an aqueous feed solution inlet

Art Unit: 1793

stream to locally form the aqueous feed solution as claimed. In addition, since the apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley is structurally the same as the claimed halogen dioxide generating system, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious that the apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley is capable of consume power at about one Watt or less as claimed.

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of Buckley, and further in view of Kaczur.

The teachings of Kelley in view of Buckley are discussed in paragraph 10 above. Buckley further teaches that a semi-permeable porous ceramic separator is place between the anode and cathode of the electrolysis cell in order to achieve an adequate flow of solution between the anode and the cathode chambers to provide acceptable electrical resistance while being sufficiently non-permeable to prevent gross mixing of anolyte and catholyte (col. 24 lines 44-65). Buckley further teaches the claimed return passage for returning the depleted effluent back to the source(Fig. 2 # 126).

Regarding claim 17, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the porous ceramic separator as taught by Buckley into the electrolytic cell of Kelley in view of Buckley in order to achieve an adequate flow of solution between the anode and the cathode chambers to provide acceptable electrical resistance while being sufficiently non-permeable to prevent gross mixing of anolyte and catholyte as taught by Buckley. In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would also have found it obvious to incorporate the return passage for depleted effluent back to

Art Unit: 1793

feed stream as taught by Cowley into the apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley in order to reduce operating cost and increase efficiency by recycling electrolyte.

Therefore, the porous ceramic separator in the apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley reads on the claimed non-conducting porous flow barrier. In addition, the apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley comprises the claimed passage.

However, Kelley in view of Buckley do not explicitly teach that the metal anode is porous.

Kaczur also teaches an electrolytic cell for the generation of chlorine dioxide (abstract). Kaczur further teaches the use of a porous platinum coated titanium anode(col. 4 lines 41-63).

Regarding claim 17, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the porous platinum coated titanium anode of Kaczur into the electrolytic apparatus of Kelley in view of Buckley in order to utilize the high surface contact area due to the porosity of the anode and achieve high corrosion resistance as taught by Kaczur (col. 4 lines 44-45 and 57-60).

In addition, the porous anode of Kelly in view of Buckley and Kaczur is capable of allow at least a portion of the aqueous feed solution flows in a cross direction to a flow of electricity between the anode and the cathode as claimed. Furthermore, the porous ceramic spacer material as taught by Kelly in view of Buckley and Kaczur is non-conductive and is capable of restricting flow of the electrolyte solution in a cross direction to the flow of electricity between the anode and the cathode as claimed.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 8 July 2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LOIS ZHENG whose telephone number is (571)272-1248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roy King/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1793

LLZ

Application/Control Number: 10/674,669
Art Unit: 1793

Page 10